

Remarks/Arguments

1. The Specification was objected to under the provisions of 132(a) for containing new matter. More particularly, the Office Action concludes that the term "primary" as used in claims 1, 7, 11 and 15 is not sufficiently disclosed in the Specification, rendering the term new matter.

Inasmuch as the Specification does not disclose any other impetus, the "kick" given must be the primary impetus. In any event, Applicant has cancelled the term from the identified claims. Thus, this objection should now be moot.

2. Claims 1-18 were rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Since the offending language has been cancelled, this rejection should now be moot (see Paragraph 1, above).

3. Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Van Ryswyk. Applicant believes that the arguments made against this rejection are substantial and should have been accepted by the Patent Office; however, in view of the allowability of claims 2-10 and 12-18, Applicant, as will be discussed further below, finds it expedient to make amendments necessary to place the application in condition for allowance under the terms proposed in the Office Action.

4. In the Office Action it is stated that claims 2-10 and 12-1 would be allowable if rewritten, as appropriate, in independent form, and if the new matter objection/rejection is overcome. Applicant submits that the cancellation of the term "primary" from the identified claims overcomes the objection/rejection.


To overcome the rejection, as proposed in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 2 and to amend claim 11 to

include the limitations of claim 12. The remainder of the claims should be allowable with the cancellation of the term "primary".

In summary, claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 13 and 15 have been amended, claims 2 and 12 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 3-11 and 13-18 remain in the application. Applicant submits that all rejections and objections have been overcome, and respectfully requests that they be withdrawn and that the application be allowed.

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice, the Examiner is expressly authorized to call Applicant's attorney, collect, at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, if in his judgment disposition of this application could be expedited or if he considers the application ready for final disposition by other than allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,



John B. Mitchell
Reg. No. 26,485
Customer No. 25,542
Attorney for CNH America LLC
Phone: 717.314.2844

Date: January 9, 2006